

## REMARKS

Claims 9-27 were pending in the application. Claims 9, 10, and 27 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,151,609 (Truong). Claims 11-17 and 20-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong in view of US patent 7,054,952 (Schwerdtfeger et al.). Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong in view of Schwerdtfeger and in view of publication WO 2002-095954 (Lee et al.).

Claims 9-26 are canceled herein. Claim 27 is amended. Claims 28-40 are new. No new matter has been added. Claims 27-40 are presented for examination.

### Response to abstract objections

The abstract has been revised herein. No new matter is added.

### Response to drawing objections

Reference number 9 is found in the last line of paragraph 25 of the substitute specification. Reference number 10 is found in the first line of page 8. Reference number 12 is found in the first line of paragraph 33.

### Response to claim objections

The alternative term "and/or" has been removed from the claims.

### Claim amendments

The term "device" in the claims is changed herein to "server" per Applicant's par. 14, last line: *"As a rule device 1 takes the form of a server."*

The first set of claims 9-26 is rewritten as a new set of claims 33-40 to clarify the scope of the invention and to merge some formerly dependent elements into the base claim 33. Dependent claims are added to each base claim 27 and 33 to recite embodiments of the access management device 11 as described in paragraphs 29-31 of the substitute specification.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 102

The 35 USC 102 rejection was cited only against claims 9, 10, and 27. Elements of claims 11 and 13 regarding format conversions are now incorporated into the base claims 27 and 33 to eliminate this rejection.

In the rejection of claim 9, Examiner cites Truong's browser 32 in his client 12 as corresponding to Applicant's second mechanism or means 6 for receiving files. However, Applicant's second means 6, is in the server 1 as shown in FIGs 2 and 3, not in the client 4, so Truong's browser 32 does not correspond to Applicant's second means 6. The location of Applicant's interface 6, 8 and memory 7 is clarified by amendments herein. Applicant's first 8 and second 6 means are described in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the substitute specification.

Regarding claim 27: Examiner cites Truong's storage 44 as corresponding to Applicant's first 8 and second 6 means in the interface. The amendments herein clarify that Applicant's first 8 and second 6 means are communications and format conversion means.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 103

Schwerdtfeger teaches display of electronic documents 12 on a client device 22 via a server 16 and an interim server 26 with a transcoder proxy 28. However, he does not teach editing the documents 12 on the client and transmitting them back from the client to be stored on an original storage device of the document as in Applicant's invention. Thus, he does not teach an element equivalent to Applicant's second means 6.

Regarding claims 13, 17, and now claims 27 and 33: Examiner cites Schwerdtfeger col. 6, lines 55-57 and col. 7, lines 11-25. However "vice versa" is not found in these lines. In other words, the function of Applicant's second means for receiving files created or modified from each remote client, converting the received files into the first format, and storing the received files into the storage system in the first format, is not found in Schwerdtfeger.

Regarding claims 20-26, and now claims 29-32, 35, and 37-40: Examiner cites the following lines:

Schwerdtfeger col. 3, lines 53-57: *"Elements of the electronic document are associated with corresponding identifiers within the model. The transcoder proxy uses the JAVASCRIPT event information and the identifier provided by the client machine to access the element and the JAVASCRIPT code within the model."*

These lines do not teach Applicant's access management device as claimed. There is no teaching of locking a file or providing exclusive reserved access to a single client or of prioritizing access depending on time or authorization level as claimed. The above lines of Schwerdtfeger refer to a model of a document created by a transcoder proxy in which elements of the original document are referenced by identifiers.

Lee does not address the deficiencies of Truong and Schwerdtfeger as argued under 35 USC sections 102 and 103 above.

Conclusion

For anticipation under 35 USC 102, a reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02(a) IV). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as recited in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim (MPEP §2131). These criteria are not met for any of the claims by Truong, as argued above. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 rejections.


M.P.E.P. 2143.03 provides that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.

As argued above, the proposed combinations do not produce the invention as claimed, so they do not support the obviousness rejections. The formal objections have been addressed. Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/15/08

By:   
John P. Musone  
Registration No. 44,961  
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830